

Remarks

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10 have been amended. Claims 8 and 12 have been cancelled.

Claims 21-26 have been added. Therefore, claims 1-7, 9-11, and 21-26 are presented for examination.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Edmonds et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,412,079), in view of Miller (U.S. Patent No. 5,829,130). Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Edmonds in view of Miller.

Edmonds discloses a computer system including a plurality of interdependent processors for operating a common set of applications. Each interdependent processor executes an independent operating system image without sharing file system state information. Each interdependent processor has a network access card with a first network connections and a second network connection. The computer system further includes a first active backplane coupled to each first network connection of each processor; a second active backplane coupled to each second network connection of each processor, the second active backplane operating in lieu of the first active backplane in case of a fail-over; and one or more directors coupled to the first and second active backplanes, each of the one or more directors load-balancing requests directed at the plurality of servers. (Edmonds at Abstract.)

Miller discloses a method of assembling and installing a communication network. The method includes the steps of providing a cabinet having a first set of connectors secured thereto, mounting a plurality of network devices within the cabinet at an assembly site,

coupling the plurality of network devices to the first set of connectors with a wiring harness at the assembly site, loading software onto at least one of the plurality of network devices at the assembly site, and connecting the first set of connectors to a main distribution frame at an installation site. (Miller at Abstract.)

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

An apparatus comprising:
a card rack; and
two or more server node cards mounted on the card rack, each server node card including:
a server to perform integrated switching, routing, load balancing, and fail-over functions; and
a plurality of ports, wherein at least one port to directly connect to another server node card in the card rack and at least one port to connect to an external connection to another card rack including other server node cards; and
an interface card mounted on the card rack separate from the two or more server node cards, the interface card to provide the external connection to the another card rack and to provide a connection to an external network, wherein the interface card to connect to each of the server node cards in the card rack via interconnections to at least one of the ports of each of the server node cards.

Applicant submits that Edmonds does not disclose or suggest an interface card mounted on the card rack separate from the two or more server node cards, the interface card to provide the external connection to the another card rack and to provide a connection to an external network, wherein the interface card to connect to each of the server node cards in the card rack via interconnections to at least one of the ports of each of the server node cards, as recited by claim 1. Applicant can find no disclosure or suggestion of such a feature anywhere in Edmonds.

Similarly, applicant submits that Miller does not disclose or suggest such a feature. Miller recites a “backplane and associated hardware, which include known circuit card slots (not shown), receive one or more circuit cards 92 in a conventional manner.” (Miller at col.

5, ll. 54-57.) However, the interface card of claim 1 is *mounted on the card rack separate from the two or more server node cards*. The interface card does not operate as a backplane does because it does not itself receive the server node cards; rather the interface card is another card on the card rack which provides connections to other external resources.

Therefore, as neither Edmonds nor Miller individually disclose or suggest the features of claim 1, any combination of Edmonds and Miller also does not disclose or suggest these features. As a result, claim 1 is patentable over Edmonds in view of Miller. Claims 2-4 and 21-22 depend from claim 1 and include additional limitations. As such, claims 2-4 and 21-22 are also patentable over Edmonds in view of Miller.

Independent claims 5 and 9 also recite, in part, an interface card mounted on the card rack separate from the two or more server node cards, the interface card to provide the external connection to the another card rack and to provide a connection to an external network, wherein the interface card to connect to each of the server node cards in the card rack via interconnections to at least one of the ports of each of the server node cards. As discussed above, Edmonds in view of Miller does not disclose or suggest such a feature. Therefore, claims 5 and 9, as well as their respective dependent claims, are patentable over Edmonds in view of Miller.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Applicant respectfully petitions for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: November 8, 2005

Ashley R. Ott
Reg. No. 55,515



12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(303) 740-1980